APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,270	02/28/2002	Edward Moseley	ADAPP227	4039

25920	7590	07/31/2006

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE
SUITE 200
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

EXAMINER
ELAHEE, MD S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2614	

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/086,270	MOSELEY, EDWARD
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Md S. Elahee	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 May 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14,16-23 and 25* is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14, 16-23 and 25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

  1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

  2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

  3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 05/02/2006. Claims 1-14, 16-23 and 25 are pending. Claims 6, 15 and 24 have been cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed on 05/02/2006 Remarks have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the needs at this time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

    1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
    2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
    3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
    4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness
          or nonobviousness.

5.   Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 16, 18, 19, 21-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Edinger et al. (U.S. 2002/0194047) in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

    Regarding claim 1, with respect to Figures 1-3, Edinger teaches a method of determining

a support entitlement level comprising:

    receiving a product support request from a customer (fig.1, item 1), wherein the product

support request relates to a product manufactured by a receiving party (abstract; page 1,

paragraph 0015, page 3, paragraphs 0077, 0078, page 4, paragraph 0090);

    receiving a service request ID [i.e., technical support identification (TSID)] from the

customer (page 5, paragraph 0118);

    validating the TSID (page 5, paragraph 0123, page 6, paragraph 0170);

    classifying the valid TSID into at least one of a plurality of classifications, wherein the

plurality of classifications includes a contract classification (page 5, paragraph 0125, page 6,

paragraphs 0126, 0170, 0171, page 7, paragraph 0173)

    assigning at least one of a plurality of support levels to the classified TSID wherein the

assigned support level corresponds to the TSID classification and wherein the TSID is received,

validated, classified and the support level assigned before an agent is notified of the product

support request (page 4, paragraph 0098, page 5, paragraph 0125, page 7, paragraph 0173, page

11, paragraph 0290);

enabling delivery of the assigned support level including providing exception handling if the TSID is not valid (page 5, paragraph 0125, page 7, paragraph 0173, page 9, paragraph 0240, page 11, paragraph 0290); and

However, Edinger does not specifically teach "providing complimentary product support if the TSID is not valid". Applicant's admitted prior art teaches providing complimentary product support (fig.1, item 132) if the customer is not authorized any product support [i.e., TSID is not valid] (fig.1, item 110) (page 3, paragraphs 7,8). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger to incorporate providing complimentary product support if the TSID is not valid as taught by Applicant's admitted prior art. The motivation for the modification is to provide free technical assistance to satisfy a customer.

Regarding claim 2, Edinger teaches receiving the TSID includes receiving the TSID via a telephone keypad entry (page 5, paragraph 0116).

Regarding claims 3 and 8, Edinger teaches receiving at least one of a plurality of aspects of a unit from the customer (page 6, paragraph 0128, page 7, paragraph 0173); and

retrieving the TSID from at least one of a plurality of databases, wherein the retrieved TSID matches at least one of the plurality of aspects of the unit in the at least one of the plurality of databases (page 2, paragraph 0027, page 4, paragraphs 0086, 0099, page 5, paragraph 0123, page 7, paragraph 0173).

Regarding claim 5, Edinger teaches that the TSID is numeric (page 3, paragraph 0040).

Regarding claim 7, Edinger teaches classifying the valid TSID as a contract TSID if the TSID identifies at least one of a group consisting of a first support contract and a unit assigned to a second support contract (page 7, paragraph 0173); and

assigning at least one of a plurality of support levels to the classified TSID includes assigning an authorized support level to the contract TSID (page 4, paragraph 0098, page 5, paragraph 0125, page 7, paragraph 0173, page 11, paragraph 0290).

Regarding claim 16, Edinger teaches notifying an agent (page 5, paragraph 0125, page 7, paragraph 0173, page 11, paragraph 0290).

Claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Edinger teaches a management model [i.e., automated call distributor (ACD)], wherein the ACD provides access to a customer (fig.2-4; col.7, lines 23-25, 50-65) and whein the ACD includes:

a processor (inherent for management model); and

a database [i.e., memory] system coupled to the processor, wherein the memory system includes instructions executable by the processor (page 4, paragraphs 0086, 0099).

Regarding claim 19, Edinger teaches the memory system further includes instructions executable by the processor to enable delivery of the assigned support level (page 5, paragraph 0125, page 7, paragraph 0173, page 9, paragraph 0240, page 11, paragraph 0290).

Regarding claim 21, Edinger teaches that the ACD includes access to a plurality of databases (page 2, paragraph 0027, page 4, paragraph 0099).

Regarding claim 22, Edinger teaches an agent's desktop, wherein the agent's desktop is linked to the ACD (page 4, paragraph 0098).

Regarding claim 23, Edinger teaches that the access to the customer includes a telephone interface (page 4, paragraph 0098).

Claim 25 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 18. Furthermore, Edinger teaches that he product support request being received from an interactive web site coupled to the ACD via an Internet connection, wherein the product support request relates to a product manufactured by a receiving party and wherein the product is in data communication with the interactive web site (page 4, paragraphs 0087, 0090, 0098); and

receiving a technical support identification (TSID) from the customer, wherein the TSID is stored within the product, wherein receiving the TSID includes automatically retrieving the TSID from the product and automatically retrieving at least one of a plurality of additional

details for the product (page 2, paragraph 0027, page 3, paragraphs 0040, 0077, page 4, paragraphs 0086, 0099).

6.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edinger et al. (U.S. 2002/0194047) in view of Applicant's admitted prior art further in view of Lawrence et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,430,866).

Regarding claim 4, Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "a unit serial number, a host system serial number, a unit source and a unit part number". Lawrence teaches a unit serial number, a host system serial number, a unit source and a unit part number (fig.1, 2; col.4, lines 34-41, col.5, lines 9-11). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to incorporate a unit serial number, a host system serial number, a unit source and a unit part number as taught by Lawrence. The motivation for the modification is to provide detail information about the device to a support team so that the customer can get technical assistance for a particular device.

7.   Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edinger et al. (U.S. 2002/0194047) in view of Applicant's admitted prior art further in view of Hughes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,535,204).

Regarding claim 6, Edinger teaches that confirming the TSID includes a predetermined number of characters (page 3, paragraph 0040);

confirming the TSID matches at least one TSID entry in at least one of a plurality of databases (page 4, paragraph 0099); and

confirming the TSID matches inherently a predetermined format (page 4, paragraph 0099).

Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "confirming the TSID includes a correct checksum". Hughes teaches confirming the TSID includes a correct checksum (fig.9; col.3, lines 62-64, col.13, lines 9, 10). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to confirm the TSID includes a correct checksum as taught by Hughes. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to enable a check for a correct reading of a number.

8.   Claims 9 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edinger et al. (U.S. 2002/0194047) in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

Regarding claim 9, Edinger teaches an email support level, an OEM support level (page 4, paragraphs 0090, 0098).

However, Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "an end of life support level, a knowledge base support level and an illicit product support level". However, Examiner takes Official Notice that an end of life support level, a knowledge base

support level and an illicit product support level are well known in the art. Thus, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to incorporate a

plurality of support levels in order to handle incoming telephone calls so that the different types

of need of customer is met efficiently.

Regarding claim 17, Edinger teaches creating a new incident record, determining if there

is an open incident record associated with the TSID (page 5, paragraph 0123).

However, Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach

"retrieving the open incident record if the open incident is associated with the TSID and

outputting the new incident record and the open incident record to the agent". However,

Examiner takes Official Notice that retrieving the open incident record if the open incident is

associated with the TSID and outputting the new incident record and the open incident record to

the agent are well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art the time the invention was made to incorporate retrieving the open incident record if the

open incident is associated with the TSID and outputting the new incident record and the open

incident record to the agent in order to monitor the status of a problem associated with a product

and provide extra care to resolve it.

9.   Claims 10-14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Edinger et al. (U.S. 2002/0194047) in view of Applicant's admitted prior art further in view of

Thomson et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0061104).

Regarding claim 10, Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "classifying the TSID as an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) TSID if the TSID is associated with a unit having an OEM distribution channel in at least one of the plurality of databases". Thomson teaches classifying the TSID as an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) TSID if the TSID is associated with a unit having an OEM distribution channel in at least one of the plurality of databases (abstract; fig.3A; page 2, paragraphs 0018-0021). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to classify the TSID as an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) TSID if the TSID is associated with a unit having an OEM distribution channel in at least one of the plurality of databases as taught by Thomson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide warranty information for a particular product.

Regarding claim 11, Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "classifying the OEM TSID as an illicit TSID if the customer obtained the unit from a source other than the OEM distribution channel". Thomson teaches classifying the OEM TSID as a fraud [i.e., illicit] TSID if the customer obtained the unit from a source other than the OEM distribution channel (page 2, paragraph 0018, page 7, paragraph 0100). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to classify the OEM TSID as an illicit TSID if the customer obtained the unit from a source other than the OEM distribution channel as taught by

Thomson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to detect whether warranty claim for a particular product is fraud.

Regarding claim 12, Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "classifying the TSID as an illicit TSID if a unit corresponding to the TSID is identified as a counterfeit unit". Thomson teaches classifying the TSID as a fraud [i.e., illicit] TSID if a unit corresponding to the TSID is identified as a counterfeit unit (abstract; fig.3A; page 2, paragraphs 0018-0020). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to classifying the TSID as an illicit TSID if a unit corresponding to the TSID is identified as a counterfeit unit as taught by Thomson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to prevent illegal use of warranty for a product.

Claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 12. Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "reporting the illicit TSID". Thomson teaches reporting the fraud [i.e., illicit] TSID (page 2, paragraph 0018, page 7, paragraph 0100). (Note; reporting is inherent) Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to report the illicit TSID as taught by Thomson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to notify whether a particular product ID is illegal.

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 3. Furthermore, Edinger teaches the customer's OS is one of the plurality of aspects of the unit (page 3, paragraph 0042).

However, Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "the unit corresponds to the TSID". Thomson teaches that the unit corresponds to the demographic [i.e., TSID] (page 2, paragraph 0018, page 7, paragraph 0100). (Note; reporting is inherent) Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to report the illicit TSID as taught by Thomson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to receive identification for a particular product.

Regarding claim 20, Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically teach "the ACD includes a server". Thomson teaches that the ACD includes a server (page 7, paragraphs 0093, 0094, 0097, 0098). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edinger in view of Applicant's admitted prior art to have the ACD including a server as taught by Thomson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to handle request from a customer.

Conclusion

10.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Franco (U.S. 2004/0044585) teach Customer service management system;

Spira et al. (U.S. 2002/0035495) teach Method of providing maintenance services;

Buford et al. (U.S. 2003/0041126) teach Parsing of nested internet electronic mail documents;

Hernandez et al. (U.S. 6,542,601) teach Method and system for automated customer support services;

Hernandez et al. (U.S. 6,327,363) teach Method and system for automated customer services; and

Ford (U.S. 7,035,808) teach Arrangement for resource and work-item selection.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S. Elahee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M E
MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE
July 24, 2006

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600